

HEIGHTS IN FINITE PROJECTIVE SPACE, AND A PROBLEM ON DIRECTED GRAPHS

MELVYN B. NATHANSON AND BLAIR D. SULLIVAN

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathbf{F}_p = \mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$. The *height* of a point $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \in \mathbf{F}_p^d$ is $h_p(\mathbf{a}) = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d (ka_i \bmod p) : k = 1, \dots, p-1 \right\}$. Explicit formulas and estimates are obtained for the values of the height function in the case $d = 2$, and these results are applied to the problem of determining the minimum number of edges the must be deleted from a finite directed graph so that the resulting subgraph is acyclic.

1. HEIGHTS IN FINITE PROJECTIVE SPACE

Let F be a field and let $F^* = F \setminus \{0\}$. For $d \geq 2$, we define an equivalence relation on the set of nonzero d -tuples $F^d \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ as follows: $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \sim (b_1, \dots, b_d)$ if there exists $k \in F^*$ such that $(b_1, \dots, b_d) = (ka_1, \dots, ka_d)$. We denote the equivalence class of $(a_1, \dots, a_d)$ by $\langle a_1, \dots, a_d \rangle$. The set of equivalence classes is called the $(d-1)$ -dimensional projective space over the field F , and denoted $\mathbf{P}^{d-1}(F)$.

We consider projective space over the finite field $\mathbf{F}_p = \mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$. For every $x \in \mathbf{F}_p$, we denote by $x \bmod p$ the least nonnegative integer in the congruence class x . We define the *height* of the point $\mathbf{a} = \langle a_1, \dots, a_d \rangle \in \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$ by

$$h_p(\mathbf{a}) = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d (ka_i \bmod p) : k = 1, \dots, p-1 \right\}.$$

For every nonempty set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$, we define

$$H_p(\mathcal{A}) = \{h_p(\mathbf{a}) : \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Then $H_p(\mathcal{A})$ is a set of positive integers.

For $\mathbf{a} = \langle a_1, \dots, a_d \rangle \in \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$, let $d^*(\mathbf{a})$ denote the number of nonzero components of $\mathbf{a}$, that is, the number of $a_i \neq 0$. The function $d^*(\mathbf{a})$ is well-defined, that is, independent of the representative of the equivalence class of $\mathbf{a}$. For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$, we define

$$d^*(\mathcal{A}) = \max\{d^*(\mathbf{a}) : \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Date: February 2, 2008.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 05C38, 05C40, 11A07.

Key words and phrases. Heights, finite projective space, finite directed graphs, acyclic directed graphs, Caccetta-Haggkvist conjecture.

The work of M.B.N. was supported in part by grants from the NSA Mathematical Sciences Program and the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program.

The work of B.D. S. was supported in part by a Department of Homeland Security Dissertation Grant.

Then $h_p(\mathbf{a}) \leq d^*(\mathbf{a})(p-1)$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$. We can reduce this upper bound by a simple averaging argument.

For every real number t , let $[t]$ denote the greatest integer not exceeding t .

Lemma 1. *For every point $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$,*

$$h_p(\mathbf{a}) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d^*(\mathbf{a})p}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Proof. If $a \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$, then $\{ka \bmod p : k = 1, \dots, p-1\} = \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ and so

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} (ka \bmod p) = \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} k = \frac{p(p-1)}{2}.$$

It follows that for every $\mathbf{a} = \langle a_1, \dots, a_d \rangle \in \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^d (ka_i \bmod p) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} (ka_i \bmod p) = \frac{d^*(\mathbf{a})p(p-1)}{2}.$$

Since the minimum of a set of numbers does not exceed the average of the set, we have

$$h_p(\mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^d (ka_i \bmod p) = \frac{d^*(\mathbf{a})p}{2}.$$

The Lemma follows from the fact that the heights are positive integers. $\square$

Lemma 2. *For every odd prime p and $d \geq 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \max(H_p(\mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p))) &= \frac{dp}{2} && \text{if } d \text{ is even} \\ \frac{(d-1)p}{2} + 1 &\leq \max(H_p(\mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p))) \leq \frac{dp-1}{2} && \text{if } d \text{ is odd.} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $2r \leq d$ and $a_1, \dots, a_r, a_{2r+1}, \dots, a_d$ are nonzero elements of the field $\mathbf{F}_p$, then the point

$$\mathbf{a} = \langle a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r, -a_1, -a_2, \dots, -a_r, a_{2r+1}, \dots, a_d \rangle,$$

satisfies $d^*(\mathbf{a}) = d$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^d (ka_i \bmod p) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r ((ka_i \bmod p) + (-ka_i \bmod p)) + \sum_{i=2r+1}^d (ka_i \bmod p) \\ &\geq rp + d - 2r \end{aligned}$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, p-1$. If $d - 2r \leq p-1$, then we can choose distinct elements $a_{2r+1}, \dots, a_d$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^d (ka_i \bmod p) \geq rp + \frac{(d-2r)(d-2r+1)}{2}.$$

Applying Lemma 1 and the inequality with $r = [d/2]$, we obtain $h_p(\mathbf{a}) = dp/2$ if d is even and

$$\frac{(d-1)p}{2} + 1 \leq h_p(\mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{dp-1}{2}$$

if d is odd. This completes the proof. $\square$

2. HEIGHTS ON THE FINITE PROJECTIVE LINE

The projective line $\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{F}_p)$ consists of all equivalence classes of pairs (a_1, a_2) , where $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbf{F}_p$ and a_1 and a_2 are not both 0. If $a_1 = 0$, then $\langle 0, a_2 \rangle = \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ and $h_p(\langle 0, 1 \rangle) = 1$. If $a_2 = 0$, then $\langle a_1, 0 \rangle = \langle 1, 0 \rangle$ and $h_p(\langle 1, 0 \rangle) = 1$. If $a_1 \neq 0$ and $a_2 \neq 0$, then $\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle = \langle 1, a_1^{-1}a_2 \rangle$. Thus, for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{F}_p)$, if $\mathbf{a} \neq \langle 1, 0 \rangle$ and $\mathbf{a} \neq \langle 0, 1 \rangle$, then $\mathbf{a} = \langle 1, a \rangle$ for some $a \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$, and $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \geq 2$.

Lemma 3. *Let p be an odd prime and $a \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$. Then*

- (i) $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq 1 + (a \bmod p)$ for all a ,
- (ii) $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = 1 + (a \bmod p)$ if $a \bmod p < \sqrt{p}$,
- (iii) $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = 2$ if and only if $a = 1 + p\mathbf{Z}$,
- (iv) $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = 3$ if and only if $a = 2 + p\mathbf{Z}$ or $a = (p+1)/2 + p\mathbf{Z}$,
- (v) $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = p$ if and only if $a = p-1 + p\mathbf{Z}$,
- (vi) Let $a = p-b + p\mathbf{Z}$ for $1 \leq b \leq p-1$. Then $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq (p + (b-1)^2)/b$.

Proof. For all $a \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ we have $ka \bmod p \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$, and so

$$h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = \min\{k + (ka \bmod p) : k = 1, \dots, p-1\} \leq 1 + (a \bmod p).$$

Note that $ka \bmod p \leq k(a \bmod p)$ for all $k \geq 1$. If $k \geq a \bmod p$, then $k + (ka \bmod p) \geq (a \bmod p) + 1$. If $1 \leq k \leq (a \bmod p) - 1$ and $(a \bmod p) < \sqrt{p}$, then

$$ka \bmod p \leq k(a \bmod p) \leq ((a \bmod p) - 1)(a \bmod p) \leq (a \bmod p)^2 < p$$

It follows that $ka \bmod p = k(a \bmod p)$ and

$$k + (ka \bmod p) = k + k(a \bmod p) \geq 1 + (a \bmod p).$$

and so $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = 1 + (a \bmod p)$. This proves (i) and (ii).

We have $k + (ka \bmod p) = 2$ if and only if $k = 1$ and $ka \bmod p = a \bmod p = 1$, that is, $a = 1 + p\mathbf{Z}$. Similarly, $k + (ka \bmod p) = 3$ if and only if either $k = 1$ and $ka \bmod p = a \bmod p = 2$, or $k = 2$ and $ka \bmod p = 2a \bmod p = 1$. In the first case, $a = 2 + p\mathbf{Z}$ and, in the second case, $a = (p+1)/2 + p\mathbf{Z}$. This proves (iii) and (iv).

If $a = -1 + p\mathbf{Z}$, then $k + (ka \bmod p) = k + (p-k) = p$ for all $k = 1, \dots, p-1$ and so $h_p(1, a) = p$. Conversely, if $h_p(1, a) = p$, then $k + (ka \bmod p) = p$ for some k , and so $ka \bmod p = -k \bmod p$ and $a = -1 + p\mathbf{Z}$. This proves (v).

Finally, to prove (vi), we let $a = qb + r$, where $q = [p/b]$ and $1 \leq r \leq p-1$. Then

$$qa = \left[\frac{p}{b}\right](p-b) + p\mathbf{Z} = p - \left[\frac{p}{b}\right]b + p\mathbf{Z} = r + p\mathbf{Z}$$

and so $qa \bmod p = r$. Therefore,

$$h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq q + r = \frac{p + r(b-1)}{b} \leq \frac{p + (b-1)^2}{b}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 1. *Let p be an odd prime and $a \in \mathbf{F}_p$. Then $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = (p+1)/2$ if and only if $a = (p-1)/2 + p\mathbf{Z}$ or $a = p-2 + p\mathbf{Z}$. If*

$$a \notin \{(p-1)/2 + p\mathbf{Z}, p-2 + p\mathbf{Z}, p-1 + p\mathbf{Z}\},$$

then

$$h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq \frac{p-1}{2}.$$

Proof. The Theorem is true for $p = 3, 5$, and 7 , so we can assume that $p \geq 11$.

Let $a = p - 2 + p\mathbf{Z}$. If $1 \leq k \leq (p - 1)/2$, then

$$k + (ka \bmod p) = k + (p - 2k) = p - k \geq \frac{p+1}{2}$$

and $k + (ka \bmod p) = (p + 1)/2$ when $k = (p - 1)/2$. If $k \geq (p + 1)/2$, then $k + (ka \bmod p) \geq (p + 3)/2$. Therefore, $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = (p + 1)/2$.

Let $a = (p - 1)/2 + p\mathbf{Z}$. If $j = 1, \dots, (p - 1)/2$ and $k = 2j$, then

$$k + (ka \bmod p) = 2j + (j(p - 1) \bmod p) = 2j + (p - j) = p + j \geq p + 1.$$

If $k = 2j - 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} k + (ka \bmod p) &= (2j - 1) + \left(\frac{(2j - 1)(p - 1)}{2} \bmod p \right) \\ &= (2j - 1) + \left(\frac{p + 1}{2} - j \right) \\ &= \frac{p + 2j - 1}{2} \geq \frac{p + 1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 + (a \bmod p) = (p + 1)/2$, it follows that $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = (p + 1)/2$.

If $a \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$ and $a \bmod p \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, (p - 3)/2\}$, then

$$h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq 1 + (a \bmod p) \leq \frac{p - 1}{2}$$

by Lemma 3 (i). If $a \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$ and $a \bmod p = (p + 1)/2$, then $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = 3 < (p + 1)/2$ by Lemma 3 (iv).

Let $a \in \mathbf{F}_p^*$ and $(p + 3)/2 \leq a \bmod p \leq p - 3$. There is an integer b such that

$$3 \leq b \leq \frac{p - 3}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad a = p - b + p\mathbf{Z}.$$

By Lemma 3 (vi) we have $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq (p + (b - 1)^2) / b$, and so $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq (p - 1)/2$ if

$$2b + 1 + \frac{4}{b - 2} \leq p.$$

If $4 \leq b \leq (p - 3)/2$, then

$$2b + 1 + \frac{4}{b - 2} \leq 2b + 3 \leq p.$$

If $b = 3$, then $h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) = h_p(\langle 1, p - 3 \rangle) \leq (p - 1)/2$ since

$$2b + 1 + \frac{4}{b - 2} = 11 \leq p.$$

This completes the proof. □

TABLE OF HEIGHTS FOR PRIMES $11 \leq p \leq 29$

prime p	$a \bmod p$	$h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle)$	prime p	$a \bmod p$	$h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle)$
11	2	3	23	2	3
	3	4		3	4
	4	4		4	5
	5	6		5	6
	6	3		6	5
	7	5		7	8
	8	5		8	4
	9	6		9	7
13	2	3		10	8
	3	4		11	12
	4	5		12	3
	5	5		13	5
	6	7		14	6
	7	3		15	9
	8	5		16	5
	9	4		17	8
17	10	5		18	7
	11	7		19	8
	2	3		20	9
	3	4		21	12
	4	5	29	2	3
	5	6		3	4
	6	4		4	5
	7	6		5	6
	8	9		6	6
	9	3		7	8
	10	5		8	7
	11	7		9	10
19	12	5		10	4
	13	5		11	7
	14	7		12	7
	15	9		13	10
	2	3		14	15
	3	4		15	3
	4	5		16	5
	5	5		17	7
19	6	7		18	8
	7	5		19	11
	8	7		20	5
	9	10		21	8
	10	3		22	5
	11	5		23	9
	12	7		24	9
	13	4		25	8
	14	7		26	11
	15	7		27	15
	16	7			
	17	10			

3. PROBLEMS ON HEIGHTS

Problem 1. Let $d \geq 2$ and $\mathbf{a} = \langle a_1, \dots, a_d \rangle \in \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$. Is there a simple formula to compute $h_p(\mathbf{a})$? Is there a simple formula to estimate $h_p(\mathbf{a})$? This is not known even for the projective line $d = 2$.

Problem 2. By Theorem 1 and Lemma 3, we have

$$H_p(\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{F}_p)) \cap \left(\frac{p+1}{2}, p \right) = \emptyset.$$

For which positive integers r does there exist a number c_r such that

$$H_p(\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{F}_p)) \cap \left(\frac{p}{r+1} + c_r, \frac{p}{r} - c_r \right) = \emptyset$$

for all sufficiently large p ?

Problem 3. Is there an upper bound for the heights of points in the projective plane $\mathbf{P}^2(\mathbf{F}_p)$ analogous to the upper bound in Theorem 1 for the projective line?

Problem 4. The following problem arises in graph theory. Let $k \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$ be a nonempty subset of projective space such that

- (1) If $\mathbf{a} = \langle a_1, \dots, a_d \rangle \in \mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_p)$, then the coordinates a_i are pairwise distinct.
- (2) For $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, none of the equations

$$x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_\ell = 0$$

has a solution with $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d\}$. (These conditions are homogeneous and independent of the representative of the equivalence class of $\mathbf{a}$.)

Find an upper bound for $H_p(\mathcal{A})$.

Problem 5. Find a good definition of the height of a point in the projective space $\mathbf{P}^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_q)$ over any finite field $\mathbf{F}_q$.

4. CAYLEY GRAPHS WITH VERTEX SET $\mathbf{F}_p$

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a directed graph with vertex set V and edge set $E \subseteq V \times V$. A *directed path* of length n in G is a sequence of vertices $v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_n}$ such that $(v_{i_j}, v_{i_{j+1}})$ is an edge for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. A *directed cycle* of length n in G is a directed path $v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_n}$ such that $v_{i_n} = v_{i_0}$. A loop is a cycle of length 1, a digon is a cycle of length 2, and a triangle is a cycle of length 3. A 3-free or triangle-free graph is a graph with no loop, digon, or triangle. The graph $G = (V, E)$ is called *directed acyclic* if it has no directed cycle.

The outdegree of the vertex v is the number of edges of the form (v, v') for some vertex v' . The pigeonhole principle implies that in a finite directed graph, if the outdegree of every vertex is at least 1, then the graph contains a cycle. Thus, every finite directed acyclic graph contains at least one vertex with outdegree 0.

Theorem 2. Let $\{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{m-1}\}$ be a set of m distinct integers, and let G be a finite directed graph with vertex set $V = \{v_{k_0}, v_{k_1}, \dots, v_{k_{m-1}}\}$. The graph G is directed acyclic if and only if there is a one-to-one map $\sigma : \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\} \rightarrow \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{m-1}\}$ such that, if $(v_{\sigma(i)}, v_{\sigma(j)})$ is an edge of the graph, then $i < j$. If $\{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{m-1}\} = \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$, then G is directed acyclic if and only if there

is a permutation σ of $\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ such that $r < s$ for every edge $(v_{\sigma(r)}, v_{\sigma(s)})$ of the graph.

Proof. Let $\sigma : \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\} \rightarrow \{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{m-1}\}$ be a one-to-one map such that, if $(v_{\sigma(i)}, v_{\sigma(j)})$ is an edge of the graph, then $i < j$. If $v_{\sigma(i_0)}, v_{\sigma(i_1)}, v_{\sigma(i_2)}, \dots, v_{\sigma(i_n)}$ is a path in G , then $i_0 < i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n$ and so $i_n \neq i_0$, that is, $v_{\sigma(i_n)} \neq v_{\sigma(i_0)}$, and so no path in G is a cycle.

To prove the converse, we use induction on m . The Lemma holds for $m = 1$ and $m = 2$. Assume that $m \geq 2$ and that the Lemma is true for every finite acyclic directed graph with m vertices. If G is an acyclic directed graph with $m+1$ vertices $\{v_{k_0}, v_{k_1}, \dots, v_{k_m}\}$, then there exists a vertex v_{k_r} with outdegree 0. Consider the induced subgraph G' of G on the vertex set $\{v_{k_0}, v_{k_1}, \dots, v_{k_{r-1}}, v_{k_{r+1}}, \dots, v_{k_m}\}$. By the induction hypothesis, there is a one-to-one map σ' from $\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ into $\{k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}, k_{r+1}, \dots, k_m\}$ such that if $(v_{\sigma'(i)}, v_{\sigma'(j)})$ is an edge of the graph G' , then $\sigma'(i) < \sigma'(j)$. Extend this map to a function σ of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ by defining $\sigma(i) = \sigma'(i)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ and $\sigma(m) = k_r$. Since $v_{k_r} = v_{\sigma(m)}$ has outdegree 0, there is no edge of the form $(v_{\sigma(m)}, v_{\sigma(j)})$ for $j \leq m$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite directed graph with vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}\}$, and let σ be a permutation of $\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$. Let B_σ be the set of edges $(v_{\sigma(r)}, v_{\sigma(s)}) \in E$ with $r \geq s$. Then the subgraph $G' = (V, E \setminus B_\sigma)$ is acyclic.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 2. $\square$

Let $\beta(G)$ denote the minimum size of a set X of edges such that the graph $G' = (V, E \setminus X)$ is directed acyclic.

Corollary 2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite directed graph with vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}\}$, and let Σ_m be a set of permutations of $\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$. For $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$, let B_σ be the set of edges $(v_{\sigma(r)}, v_{\sigma(s)}) \in E$ with $\sigma(r) \geq \sigma(s)$. Then*

$$\beta(G) \leq \min \{\text{card}(B_\sigma) : \sigma \in \Sigma_m\}.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary 1. $\square$

Let $\gamma(G)$ denote the number of pairs of nonadjacent vertices in the undirected graph obtained from G by replacing each directed edge with an undirected edge. A *tournament* is a directed graph exactly one edge between every two vertices. If G is a tournament, then $\gamma(G) = 0$. Let G be a finite, triangle-free tournament. If G contains directed cycles, then the minimum length n of a directed cycle in G is 4. Let $v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_n}$ be a cycle in G of minimum length n . Since $\gamma(G) = 0$, it follows that either (v_{i_0}, v_{i_2}) or (v_{i_2}, v_{i_0}) is an edge. If (v_{i_0}, v_{i_2}) is an edge, then $v_{i_0}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_n}$ is a cycle in G of length $n-1$, which contradicts the minimality of n . If (v_{i_2}, v_{i_0}) is an edge, then $v_{i_0}, v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}$ is a triangle in G , which is impossible. It follows that every tournament is directed acyclic. Equivalently, if G is triangle-free and $\gamma(G) = 0$, then $\beta(G) = 0$.

This is a special case of a theorem of Chudnovsky, Seymour, and Sullivan[1], who proved that if G is a triangle-free digraph, then $\beta(G) \leq \gamma(G)$. They conjectured that if G is a 3-free digraph, then $\beta(G) \leq \gamma(G)/2$.

We shall consider the special case of the CSS conjecture in which the triangle-free graph is a Cayley graph $G = (\mathbf{F}_p, E_A)$ whose vertex set is the additive group

of the finite field $\mathbf{F}_p$ and whose edge set E_A is determined by a nonempty subset A of $\mathbf{F}_p^*$ by the following rule:

$$E_A = \{(x, x + a) : x \in \mathbf{F}_p \text{ and } a \in A\}.$$

Let $d = \text{card}(A)$. If the Cayley graph has neither loops nor digons, then the number of pairs of adjacent vertices is the same as the number of directed edges, which is dp , and so the number of pairs of nonadjacent vertices is

$$\gamma(G) = \binom{p}{2} - dp = \frac{p(p-1-2d)}{2}.$$

In this case the CSS conjecture asserts that

$$\beta(G) \leq \frac{p(p-1-2d)}{4}.$$

Lemma 4. *Let p be a prime number and $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d\} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_p^*$. Let $G = (\mathbf{F}_p, E_A)$ be the Cayley graph constructed from A . Let Σ_p be a set of permutations of $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. For $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, define $t_{i,j} \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ by*

$$(\sigma(i) + p\mathbf{Z}) + a_j = \sigma(t_{i,j}) + p\mathbf{Z}.$$

Then

$$E_A = \{(\sigma(i) + p\mathbf{Z}, \sigma(t_{i,j}) + p\mathbf{Z}) : i = 0, \dots, p-1 \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, d\}.$$

Let

$$B_\sigma = \{(\sigma(i) + p\mathbf{Z}, \sigma(t_{i,j}) + p\mathbf{Z}) : t_{i,j} < i\}.$$

The graph $G' = (\mathbf{F}_p, E_A \setminus B_\sigma)$ is directed acyclic for every permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$, and

$$\beta(G) \leq \min\{\text{card}(B_\sigma) : \sigma \in \Sigma_p\}.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary 2. $\square$

Theorem 3. *Let p be prime and $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d\} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_p^*$. Let $G = (\mathbf{F}_p, E_A)$ be the Cayley graph constructed from A . Then*

$$\beta(G) \leq h_p(\langle a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d \rangle) \leq \frac{dp}{2}.$$

Proof. Let $\Sigma_p = \{\sigma_k\}_{k=1}^{p-1}$ be the set of permutations of $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ defined by

$$\sigma_k(i) \equiv ki \pmod{p} \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1.$$

Fix $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. For $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, define $t_{i,j} \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\} \setminus \{i\}$ by

$$(\sigma_k(i) + p\mathbf{Z}) + a_j = \sigma_k(t_{i,j}) + p\mathbf{Z}.$$

Let u_k denote the least nonnegative integer such that $ku_k \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Then $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{p-1}\} = \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. Defining

$$r_j = u_k a_j \pmod{p},$$

we have $r_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ and

$$a_j = kr_j + p\mathbf{Z}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_k(t_{i,j}) + p\mathbf{Z} &= (\sigma_k(i) + p\mathbf{Z}) + a_j \\
&= (ki + p\mathbf{Z}) + (kr_j + p\mathbf{Z}) \\
&= k(i + r_j) + p\mathbf{Z} \\
&= \sigma_k(i + r_j) + p\mathbf{Z}
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$t_{i,j} \equiv i + r_j \pmod{p}.$$

If $i + r_j \leq p - 1$, then $t_{i,j} = i + r_j > i$. If $i + r_j \geq p$, then $t_{i,j} = i + r_j - p < i$. It follows that $t_{i,j} < i$ if and only if $i + r_j \geq p$, that is, $p - r_j \leq i \leq p - 1$ and so

$$\text{card}(B_{\sigma_k}) = \sum_{j=1}^d r_j = \sum_{j=1}^d (u_k a_j \pmod{p}).$$

By Corollary 2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(G) &\leq \min\{\text{card}(B_{\sigma_k}) : k = 1, \dots, p-1\} \\
&= \min \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^d (u_k a_j \pmod{p}) : k = 1, \dots, p-1 \right\} \\
&= \min \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^d (k a_j \pmod{p}) : k = 1, \dots, p-1 \right\} \\
&= h_p(\langle a_1, \dots, a_d \rangle).
\end{aligned}$$

The upper bound for the height comes from Lemma 2. $\square$

We return to the CSS conjecture. Since $dp/2 \leq p(p-1-2d)/4$ if and only if $d \leq (p-1)/4$, it follows that, for a fixed prime p , we only need to consider sets A of cardinality $d > p/4$. In the other direction, Hamidoune [2, 3] proved the Caccetta-Haggkvist conjecture for Cayley graphs: If $A \subseteq \mathbf{F}_p^*$ and $d = |A| \geq p/r$, then the Cayley graph $(\mathbf{F}_p, E_A)$ contains a cycle of length no greater than r . In particular, if the graph has no directed loops, digons, or triangles, then $d < p/3$. Therefore, to prove the CSS conjecture for the group $\mathbf{F}_p$, it suffices to consider only sets A of size d , where $p/4 < d < p/3$.

Theorem 4. *Let p be a prime number, $p \geq 7$, and let $A = \{a_1, a_2\} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_p^*$ with $a_1 \neq a_2$. Let $G = (\mathbf{F}_p, E_A)$ be the Cayley graph constructed from A . If G is a triangle-free digraph, then*

$$\beta(G) \leq \frac{p-1}{2} \leq \frac{\gamma(G)}{2}.$$

Proof. Since $\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle = \langle 1, a \rangle$ in $\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{F}_p)$ with $a = a_1^{-1}a_2 \neq 1$, and since $\beta(G) \leq h_p(\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle) = h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle)$, it suffices to consider the case $A = \{1, a\}$. The Cayley graph G is triangle-free if and only if none of the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
x &= 0 \\
x + y &= 0 \\
x + y + z &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

has a solution with $x, y, z \in \{1, a\}$. The first equation implies that $a \neq 0$, the second that $a \neq p - 1 + p\mathbf{Z}$, and that third that $2a + 1 \neq 0$ and $a + 2 \neq 0$, or, equivalently, that $a \neq (p - 1)/2 + p\mathbf{Z}$ or $p - 2$. It follows from Theorem 1 that

$$\beta(G) \leq h_p(\langle 1, a \rangle) \leq \frac{p-1}{2} \leq \frac{p(p-5)}{4} = \frac{\gamma(G)}{2}$$

if $p \geq 7$. This completes the proof. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Chudnovsky, P. Seymour, and B. Sullivan, *Cycles in dense digraphs*, arXiv:math.CO/0702147, 2007.
- [2] Y. O. Hamidoune, *An application of connectivity theory in graphs to factorizations of elements in groups*, European J. Combin. **2** (1981), no. 4, 349–355.
- [3] M. B. Nathanson, *The Caccetta–Haggkvist conjecture and additive number theory*, arXiv:math.CO/0603469, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LEHMAN COLLEGE (CUNY), BRONX, NEW YORK 10468
E-mail address: `melvyn.nathanson@lehman.cuny.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08544
E-mail address: `bdowling@princeton.edu`